QTL Studies- Past, Present and Future

David Evans

Genetic studies of complex diseases have not met anticipated success

Fig. 1. Identification of genes underlying human Mendelian traits and genetically complex traits in humans and other species. Cumulative data for human Mendelian trait genes (to 2001) include all major genes causing a Mendelian disorder in which causal variants have been identified (58, 59). This reflects mutations in a total of 1336 genes. Complex trait genes were identified by the whole-genome screen approach and denote cumulative year-on-year data described in this review.

Fig. 1 Number of genes identified from QTL by year. Genes for human QTL are shown in black and genes for experimental models (mouse, rat, and pig) in white. The first QTL gene was identified in 1991. There are 14 from humans and 17 from animal models (5 from rats, 11 from mice, 1 from pigs). These add up to more than 29 because some were identified in both humans and rodent models.

Korstanje & Pagan (2002) *Nat Genet*

pos, found by positional doning; tg, transgenic insertion of normal gene changes phenotype to normal (for example, transgenic rescue); ko, knockout provides additional evidence (^ahuman monogenic syndrome, beleition of ge ease, 'knockout in yeast); fu, functional difference in candidate gene. APP, amyloid precursor protein; APOE, apolipoprotein E; BRCA, breast cancer gene; FABP2, fatty acid binding protein 2; LIPC, hepatic lipase; ATP1A1, a-Na,K-ATPase; POMC, pre-pro-opiomelanocortin; II, interleukin; Cd36, fatty acid translocase; PTP1B, and water in the proposition of the present in the Area, Care in the proposition of the proposition in the protein tyrosine phosphatase-1B; PSEN, presentilin 1; Abcc2, ATP-binding cassette, subfamily C2; Hc, hemolytic comp

Korstanje & Pagan (2002) *Nat Genet*

Reasons for Failure?

BUT…Not much success in mapping complex diseases / traits ! \triangleright

LD Patterns and Allelic Association

Bennett & Todd, *Ann Rev Genet*, 1996

Alzheimers and ApoE4

Pattern of LD unpredictable \triangleright

Roses, *Nature* 2000

Extent of common genetic variation unknown \triangleright

Genome-wide Association?

The Future of Genetic Studies of **Complex Human Diseases**

Neil Risch and Kathleen Merikangas

Comparison of linkage and association stydies. Number of families needed for identification of a disease gene.

Risch & Merikangas, *Science* 1996

Multiple Rare Variant Hypothesis?

GWA assumes that common variants underlie common diseases

Are Rare Variants Responsible for Susceptibility to Complex Diseases?

Jonathan K. Pritchard

Department of Statistics, University of Oxford, Oxford

Little is known about the nature of genetic variation underlying complex diseases in humans. One popular view proposes that mapping efforts should focus on identification of susceptibility mutations that are relatively old and at high frequency. It is generally assumed—at least for modeling purposes—that selection against complex disease mutations is so weak that it can be ignored. In this article, I propose an explicit model for the evolution of complex disease loci, incorporating mutation, random genetic drift, and the possibility of purifying selection against susceptibility mutations. I show that, for the most plausible range of mutation rates, neutral susceptibility alleles are unlikely to be at intermediate frequencies and contribute little to the overall genetic variance for the disease. Instead, it seems likely that the bulk of genetic variance underlying diseases is due to loci where susceptibility mutations are mildly deleterious and where there is a high overall mutation rate to the susceptible class. At such loci, the total frequency of susceptibility mutations may be quite high, but there is likely to be extensive allelic heterogeneity at many of these loci. I discuss some practical implications of these results for gene mapping efforts.

How many diseases does it take to map a gene with SNPs?

Kenneth M. Weiss¹ & Joseph D. Terwilliger²

"They all talked at once, their voices insistent and contradictory and impatient, making of unreality a possibility, then a probability, then an incontrovertible fact, as people will when their desires become words." -W. Faulkner, The Sound and the Fury, 1929

"I found one! I found one!"

Enabling Genome-wide Association Studies

B HAPlotype MAP

High throughput genotyping \triangleright

Wellcome Trust Case Control Consortium

Wellcome Trust Case-Control Consortium

Genome-Wide Association Across Major Human Diseases

DESIGN

Collaboration amongst 26 UK disease investigators 2000 cases each from 9 diseases1000 cases from 4 diseases

GENOTYPING

Affymetrix 500k SNPs Illumina Human NS_12 SNP chip

CASES

- 1. Type 1 Diabetes
- 2. Type 2 Diabetes
- 3. Crohn's Disease
- 4. Coronary Heart Disease
- 5. Hypertension
- 6. Bipolar Disorder
- 7. Rheumatoid Arthritis
- 8. Malaria
- 9. Tuberculosis

10.Ankylosing Spondylitis

- 11.Grave's Disease
- 12.Breast Cancer
- 13.Multiple Sclerosis

CONTROLS

- 1. UK Controls A (1,500 1958 BC)
- 2. UK Controls B (1,500 NBS)
- 3. Gambian controls (2000)

Genome-wide association study of 14,000 cases of seven common diseases and 3,000 shared controls

The Wellcome Trust Case Control Consortium*

There is increasing evidence that genome-wide association (GWA) studies represent a powerful approach to the identification of genes involved in common human diseases. We describe a joint GWA study (using the Affymetrix GeneChip 500K Mapping Array Set) undertaken in the British population, which has examined ~2,000 individuals for each of 7 major diseases and a shared set of ~3,000 controls. Case-control comparisons identified 24 independent association signals at $P < 5 \times 10^{-7}$: 1 in bipolar disorder, 1 in coronary artery disease, 9 in Crohn's disease, 3 in rheumatoid arthritis, 7 in type 1 diabetes and 3 in type 2 diabetes. On the basis of prior findings and replication studies thus-far completed, almost all of these signals reflect genuine susceptibility effects. We observed association at many previously identified loci, and found compelling evidence that some loci confer risk for more than one of the diseases studied. Across all diseases, we identified a large number of further signals (including 58 loci with single-point P values between 10^{-5} and 5×10^{-7}) likely to yield additional susceptibility loci. The importance of appropriately large samples was confirmed by the modest effect sizes observed at most loci identified. This study thus represents a thorough validation of the GWA approach. It has also demonstrated that careful use of a shared control group represents a safe and effective approach to GWA analyses of multiple disease phenotypes; has generated a genome-wide genotype database for future studies of common diseases in the British population; and shown that, provided individuals with non-European ancestry are excluded, the extent of population stratification in the British population is generally modest. Our findings offer new avenues for exploring the pathophysiology of these important disorders. We anticipate that our data, results and software, which will be widely available to other investigators, will provide a powerful resource for human genetics research.

Ankylosing Spondylitis

- Auto-immune arthritis resulting in fusion of vertebrae \triangleright
- Prevalence of 0.4% in Caucasians. More common in men. \triangleright
- Often associated with psoriasis, IBD and uveitis \triangleright
- Ed Sullivan, Mike Atherton \triangleright

Ankylosing Spondylitis GWAS

Successes…

What About Quantitative Traits?

- 1 Gene \rightarrow 3 Genotypes \rightarrow 3 Phenotypes
- 2 Genes
- \rightarrow 9 Genotypes
- \rightarrow 5 Phenotypes
- 3 Genes
- \rightarrow 27 Genotypes
- \rightarrow 7 Phenotypes
- 4 Genes
- \rightarrow 81 Genotypes
- \rightarrow 9 Phenotypes

Central Limit Theorem \rightarrow Normal Distribution

- Quantitative genetics theory suggests that quantitative traits are \triangleright the result of many variants of small effect
- Unselected samples \triangleright
- The corollary is that very large sample sizes will be needed to \triangleright detect these variants in UNSELECTED samples

FTSO

WTCCC T2D Scan

- **ETO produces a moderate signal in WTCCC T2D scan**
- ▶ But, no signal in an American T2D scan...?

-American cases and controls matched on BMI

FTO

B Replication is critical !!!

Height- The Archetypal Polygenic **Trait**

Dizygotic Twins

Monozygotic Twins

Twins separated at birth

Twin, family and adoption studies suggest that, within a population, 90% of variation in height is due to genetic variation

Borjeson, Acta Paed, 1976

GWA of Height

Collaboration is the name of the game !!! \triangleright

- Some real hits sit in the bottom of the distribution \triangleright
- Some hits initially look interesting but then go away \triangleright

Hedgehog signaling, cell cycle, and extra-cellular matrix genes over-represented

The combined impact of the 20 SNPS with a P < 5 x 10-7

- **The 20 SNPs explain only ~3% of the variation of height**
- **Lots more genes to find – but extremely large numbers needed**

Weedon et al. (in press) *Nat Genet*

Height Linkage Regions

Perola et al, Plos Genetics, 2007; data available at http://www.genomeutwin.org; Weedon et al.; unpublished data

Perola et al, Plos Genetics, 2007; data available at http://www.genomeutwin.org; Weedon et al.; unpublished data

What's Going On?

D Loci identified by GWAs don't have linkage peaks over them

Linkage analysis lacks power?

Areas identified by linkage don't have significant assocation hits \triangleright over them

Type I error?

Power?

BUT…what if linkage analysis and association analysis identify \triangleright different types of loci?

What next?

Distribution of MAFs in HapMap

- Genome-wide panels and HapMap biased towards common variants \triangleright
- Common variants don't tag rare variants well \triangleright

Complex Disease Tree

Methods of gene hunting

Frequency

Genome-wide Sequencing

Sequence individuals' genomes \triangleright

Will identify rare variants \triangleright

But will we have enough power? \triangleright

Figure 2 Relationship between MAF, heterozygote GRR, and power to detect association assuming a multiplicative disease model. Results are shown for 2000, 5000, and 10 000 case-control pairs assuming a disease prevalence of 1% and a type I error rate of $\alpha = 3.6 \times 10^{-6}$. The figure illustrates that it is possible to detect rare variants of intermediate penetrance using current sample sizes of 2000 case-control pairs. To detect rare alleles of smaller effect, far larger sample sizes will need to be employed.

Genomic Profiling

 \triangleright The idea of using genetic information to inform diagnosis

Predictive testing in the case of monogenic diseases has been \triangleright used for years (1300+ tests available) (e.g. Phenylketonuria)

Not possible in complex diseases as effects of an individual \triangleright variant is so small

▶ BUT...if we consider several predisposing genetic and environmental factors, can we predict disease?

Genomic Profiling

(from Janssens et al. 2004 AJHG)

Ankylosing Spondylitis

Prevalence of B27+, ARTS1+, IL23R+ is 2.4% \triangleright

Prevalence of B27-, ARTS1-, IL23R- is 19% \triangleright

Using Genetics to Inform Classical Epidemiology

Observational Studies

- Fanciful claims often made from observational studies
- In a case-control study, a group of diseased individuals are recruited \triangleright (Cases); A group of individuals without disease are gathered (Controls); Both groups are then measured retrospectively on an exposure of interest; A test of association is performed
- Example: Obesity (Exposure) and Coronary Heart Disease (Outcome)

Odds of obesity in cases: 200/100 = 2

Odds of obesity in controls: 50/250 = 0.2

Odds Ratio: 2/0.2 = 10

Classic limitations to "observational" science

• Confounding

• Reverse Causation

•**Bias**

Randomized Control Trials

- Randomization controls for confounding \triangleright
- Reverse causation impossible \triangleright
- Gold standard for assessing causality \triangleright

- \triangleright RCTs not always ethical or possible
- Fortunately nature has provided us with a natural randomized control trial !
- Mendel's law of independent assortment states that inheritance \triangleright of a trait is independent (randomized) with respect to other traits
- Therefore individuals are randomly assigned to three groups \triangleright based on their genotype (AA, Aa, aa) independent of outcome
- Assessing the relationship between genotype, environmental risk factor and disease informs us on causality

If obesity causes CHD then the relationship between FTO and CHD \triangleright should be estimated by the product of β_{FTO-Obesity} and β_{Obesity-CHD}

<u>If CHD causes obesity then β_{FTO-CHD} should be zero.</u> \triangleright

If the relationship between Obesity and CHD is purely correlational (i.e. \triangleright <u>due to confounding) then β_{FTO-CHD} should be 0</u>

- Genotype is associated with the environmental exposure of interest \triangleright
- Genotype is NOT associated with confounders \triangleright
- Genotype is only related to its outcome via its association with \triangleright the modifiable environmental exposure

- ▶ Mendelian Randomization is a way of using a genetic variant(s) to make causal inferences about (modifiable) environmental risk factors for disease and health related outcomes
- Environmental exposures (e.g. Obesity) can be modified ! \triangleright Genetic factors cannot (at least for the moment…)
- \triangleright Still a relatively new approach that has problems (i.e. finding genetic proxies for environmental exposures- multiple instruments?)

…but a LOT of scope for development…

Could SEM be used to enhance MR?

